REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-19 and 21-22 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected. Claims 5, 6 and 8-19 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 2 and 3 are cancelled. Claim 20 is previously cancelled. Claims 1, 4 and 7 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matter of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues. New claims 21 and 22 are added.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objection cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claim 4 is objected to due to lacking antecedent basis. The claim is amended to address the basis of the objection. Accordingly withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karlyn et al (US 5,867,882). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" ***Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.***, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is deficient with regard to the following.

Independent claims 1 and 7 are both amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2 and 3. The Office Action recognizes that the subject matter of claim 3 is lacking in the disclosure of the cited Karlyn et al. reference. In particular, Karlyn et al. fails to teach or suggest the arrangement of dot angles at the claimed relative angular placement.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4 and 7 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 4 and 7 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is rejected as obvious over Karlyn et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection as applicable to amended claims 1 and 7, which now incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claim 3.

For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

In accordance with the subject matter of former claim 3, a dot angle (angle at which the dots of the dot screen separations for each printing color are set up respectively at 6 to 8 degrees for yellow (Y), at 21 to 23 degrees for magenta (M), at 51 to 53 degrees for black (K), and at 79 to 81 degrees for cyan (C). It is noted that the claim language of the amended claims has been further revised to clarify that

these intentionally set dot angles are measured relative to vertical or horizontal, which are respectively used as a 0 degree reference marker, for purposes of clarity.

It is respectfully submitted that the Karlyn et al. reference cannot render the rejected claim obvious because the reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection. Thus, the reference fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's position that the "determination of the exact optimal angles would have been readily determined by one of ordinary skill in the art through routine experimentation." Applicant submits that the flaw in the Examiner's argument is a failure to acknowledge that, faced with a myriad of possible angular relationships, one of ordinary skill in the art, without the benefit of the instant application, would have no starting point or guidelines upon which to base the alleged experimentation, since no goal would be envisioned. In this regard, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is improperly using the applicant's disclosure as a blueprint upon which to base hypothetical experimentation by one of ordinary skill in the art, which experimentation would necessarily have had to occur before the invention by the applicant, in order to render the claims obvious.

Moreover, applicant submits further, that the placement of dots angled at the claimed positions, at least in the case of printing on fabrics arranged with thread weaves running in directions of 0 degrees and 90 degrees (vertical and horizontal), avoids alignment of dot rows or columns with the weave directions, since none of the

claimed dot angles are positioned at 0 or 90 degrees, as they are in Karlyn et al. Thus, even though alleged to be only slightly different than the dot angles of Karlyn et al., the claimed invention provides clear advantage over the cited reference disclosure, at least in this regard, and therefore, the claimed feature cannot be dismissed as being merely an insignificant variant. Nonobviousness may be clearly shown where an inventor seeks to remedy a known problem, and does so by discovering a heretofore unknown source of the problem and finds a solution based upon the discovery of the problem source. *Eibel Process Co. v. Minnesota and Ontario Paper Co.*, 261 U.S. 45 (1923).

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, claims 1, 4 and 7 are believed patentable over the cited Karlyn et al. reference, and their allowance is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 21 and 22 are added and are submitted as patentable over the cited art of record based on the subject matter cited therein in addition to the subject matter of their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests a one (1) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of $60 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg by:
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicant

and,

By
Lawrence Wechsler
Reg. No. 36,049
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340